

## **REMARKS**

### **A. Introduction**

Claims 1-16 and 18 were presented for examination.

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10-13 and 16 were rejected.

Claims 3-5, 9, 14, 15, and 18 were objected.

Claims 1, 4, 11, 15, and 18 were amended.

Claims 3, 10, 13, and 14 were cancelled.

### **B. Claims 10-16 and 18 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Examiner also rejected claim 11 and claims 12-16 and 18 based on their dependency. Applicant considered Examiner's rejection and cancelled Claim 10 and amended Claim 11, overcoming this indefinite rejection. Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to withdraw his rejections.

### **C. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 and 10-13, and 16 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable under Baldwin in view of Kuhn. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin and Kuhn as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of Kozak. Examiner also rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin and Kuhn as applied to Claim 7 above, and further in view of Vanderklaauw. Examiner also rejected Claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baldwin in view of Clark and in further view of Kozak. Examiner further rejected Claim 16 as being unpatentable over Baldwin, Kuhn and Kozak as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Vanderklaauw. Finally, while Examiner also objected to Claims 3-5, 9, 14, 15, and 18, he noted that these dependent

claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the based claim and any intervening claims because, as Examiner recognized, the prior art fails to teach the limitation of the frame member which forms the lower portion of the parallelogram as being slideable within the base member.


Applicant considered Examiner's rejections and objections and respectfully disagrees with Examiner's rejection of Independent Claims 1 and 11. An artisan having common sense at the time of the invention would not have reasonably considered combining the cited references in the manner suggested by the Examiner to come up with the present invention. However, for the purpose of expediting the patent application process, Applicant amended Claims 1, 4, 11, 15, and 18 and further cancelled Claims 3, 10, 13, and 14 in response to Examiner's rejections and objections. Applicant respectfully submits that, in light of the amendments and cancellations made, further discussion of the cited references is not necessary. Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18 are now in condition for allowance. Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejections and objections and allow these claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objections. Allowance of Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18 at an early date is solicited. If Examiner still finds impediments to allow Claims Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 18 and, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference between the undersigned and the Examiner would help remove such impediments, the undersigned respectfully requests such a telephone conference.

Respectfully submitted,

GUNN & LEE, P.C.  
700 North St. Mary's Street, Suite 1500  
San Antonio, TX 78205-3596  
(210) 886-9500  
(210) 886-9883 (Fax)

By: 

Ted D. Lee

Regis. No. 25,819

Miguel Villarreal, Jr.

Regis. No. 55,700